

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct an error of a typographical nature.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that there was insufficient antecedent basis in the claims for the limitation of “inhibiting said initiator from issuing said request.”

Applicants have made clarifying amendments to independent claims 1, 9 and 15. In particular, the limitation of inhibiting “said initiator from issuing said request” has been changed to (emphasis added) inhibiting --said initiator from issuing said request for said first port to assume a state--, and the limitation of enabling “said initiator to issue said request for said first port to assume said desired state” has been changed to (emphasis added) enabling --said initiator to issue a request for said first port to assume said desired state--. These amendments are supported by, for instance, the originally filed independent claims 1, 9 and 15. These amendments clarify that the initiator is inhibited from issuing a request for the first port to assume a state. Additionally, the amendments clarify that the initiator is enabled to issue a request for the first port to assume the desired state.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 15, as now clarified by amendment, should be found to be free of rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This amendment is deemed to be cosmetic in nature, and thus was not made for a reason related to patentability, as the Examiner could have simply objected to these claims, and not rejected them under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In any event, this amendment should not be construed to impair in any way the application of the full range of equivalents for the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-12 and 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Axberg et al. (U.S. 6,009,466), and claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 19 and 20 have been rejected under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg in view of the publication “SSA: A High Performance Interface for Unparalleled Connectivity,” by Wilson. These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that Axberg does not disclose at least the limitations in the originally filed independent claims 1, 9 and 15 generally of inhibiting said initiator from issuing said request, sending data to said initiator describing a desired state of said first port, and enabling said initiator to issue a request for said first port to assume said desired state.

Applicants read Axberg as disclosing a “network configuration program” that assists users in planning the configuration of network devices in an information processing network. See Abstract of Axberg. Applicants respectfully submit that the network configuration program in Axberg never performs interactions with an initiator in a computer network. In fact, the network configuration program in Axberg appears to never configure any device, including initiators, actually residing in a physically connected network. Instead, the network configuration program of Axberg provides an object-oriented program that allows a user to plan a network configuration by using abstractions (e.g., represented by objects) of devices in a network. Thus, Axberg merely allows a user to determine what devices can be connected in a network and how those devices might be connected.

For example, Axberg states the following at col. 7, lines 14-24 (emphasis added):

The configuration planning function of the storage network management program will typically be performed before a storage network is constructed, i.e., physically connected together, although it is optionally possible to use the configuration planning function for adding to or altering an existing storage network. At this stage, host system 110 may be an isolated system, not connected to any network, or it may be connected to an information processing network via

medium 115 as shown in FIG. 1, but without a storage network yet connected.

As the cited text above indicates, the configuration planning function of the storage network management program is performed prior to physically constructing the network.

The cited text above does state that “it is optionally possible to use the configuration planning function for adding to or altering an existing storage network.” Axberg additionally states at col. 16, lines 25-28 that “[o]utput from the program could be in the form of human-readable diagrams and instructions, or configuration instructions readable by another computer system, or both.” Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully submit again that the configuration planning function appears not to configure the devices actually residing in a physically connected network. For instance, when Axberg describes what configuration data can be output for the configuration planning function, Axberg states the following at col. 15, lines 50-58 (emphasis added):

For example, one form of output may be a list of instructions for the installer of the storage network. Another form of output may be a graphical illustration of the network. Another form may be a list of addresses and paths for use by a host computer system in accessing storage devices connected to the network.

Thus, Axberg appears to make it clear that someone or something else does the configuration of the devices residing in a physically connected network, although the “configuration” of a graphical illustration of the network and paths for communication with the devices in the network can be output in Axberg.

Because Axberg appears to never disclose configuring devices residing in a physically connected network, Axberg cannot disclose at least the limitations in originally filed independent claims 1, 9 and 15, relating to configuring a computer network, generally of inhibiting said initiator from issuing said request, sending data to said initiator describing a desired state of said first port, and

enabling said initiator to issue a request for said first port to assume said desired state.

Consequently, independent claims 1, 9 and 15 are not anticipated by Axberg.


Furthermore, even if Axberg can be read to configure devices residing in a physically connected network, there is no disclosure in Axberg at least of the limitations in the originally filed claims generally of inhibiting said initiator from issuing said request, sending data to said initiator describing a desired state of said first port, and enabling said initiator to issue a request for said first port to assume said desired state. For instance, the Examiner cites col. 14, line 8 to col. 15, line 34 of Axberg as disclosing these limitations. Applicants submit that the cited text of Axberg, by contrast, describes using abstractions (e.g., represented by objects) of devices in a network when planning a network. There is no disclosure in the cited text of Axberg (or in any part of Axberg) that initiators are ever configured in a computer network. Consequently, there is no disclosure that the initiators are inhibited from issuing requests, or are sent data describing a desired state of a port, or are enabled to issue a request for a port to assume a desired state. Therefore, independent claims 1, 9 and 15 are not anticipated by Axberg.

In that claims 1, 9 and 15 are not anticipated by Axberg, and should be found to be allowable over Axberg, then all claims that depend from claims 1, 9 and 15 are also allowable over Park, whether considered alone or with the Wilson SSA-related publication.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the expressed rejections, and to allow claims 1-20 as now clarified by amendment above.

S.N. 09/617,607
Art Unit: 2142

Respectfully submitted:



Robert J. Mauri-

Reg. No.: 41,180

10/27/04
Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: rmauri@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

10/27/04

Date

Ann Okrentowich

Name of Person Making Deposit